REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2007. Claims 1-7 and 10-28 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 15 and 26 have been amended. New claims 29 and 30 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 17, 27 and 28 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-7, 10-16, 18-26, 29 and 30 are presented for examination.

Summary of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al, (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194414, hereinafter "Bateman") in view of Yamada et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,837, hereinafter "Yamada") and further in view of Terakado et al., (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0001042, hereinafter "Terakado").

Claims 4-5, 7, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada in view of Terakado and in further view of Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,954, hereinafter "Okada").

Claims 15, 18, 21-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada.

Claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada and in further view of Okada.

Claims 29-30

Claim 29 recites:

A method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device to a remote host device, the method comprising:

upon establishing a **wireless *network* connection** between a data capture device and a remote host device that is capable of communicating with said data capture device, automatically verifying that the wireless network connection has been established between said data capture device and said remote host device and automatically initiating an immediate transfer of information from said data capture device;

automatically providing notification that said transfer of information is in process; and

automatically providing notification of successful completion of said transfer of information by one of illumination or extinguishing of a light on said data capture device.

(emphasis added).

The current Office Action states:

Bateman states that the connection between the camera base unit (102, 104) and the host (108, 112) includes both tethered and wireless connections; where in the wireless case, the base unit (102, 104) is capable of wirelessly transmitting to and receiving data from the host (108, 112) (page 2, paragraphs 20-21). Therefore, it can be seen that Bateman teaches a wireless network connection between a data capture device (102, 104) and a host device (108, 112).

(Office Action, 7/05/2007, page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Office Action's conclusion that the wireless connection taught by Bateman is a wireless *network* connection. Both the wired connection and the wireless connection taught by Bateman are connections **made through a universal serial bus (USB)** or other similar external bus of a computer. (Bateman, paragraph [0021]). Such wireless connections made through an external bus (e.g., as commonly used for wireless keyboards and wireless mice) require a wireless receiver that is connected with the external bus of a computer, and which communicates wirelessly with a peripheral device (the digital camera in the case of Bateman). To enable the peripheral device (e.g., digital camera) to wirelessly communicate with the receiver, a pairing is performed to establish a wireless direct connection between the receiver and the peripheral device. Communications sent wirelessly between paired devices (e.g., a digital camera and receiver) are not sent through a network. In contrast, a wireless network connection is a wireless connection between a device and a

network. Communications sent via a wireless network connection are sent through the network. Therefore, the wireless connection taught by Bateman is not a wireless *network* connection, as required by claim 29.

Yamada teaches inserting an auxiliary memory card into a digital camera. Files may then be transferred from a main memory to the auxiliary memory card. (Yamada, col. 4, lines 32-35). The connection between the auxiliary memory card and the digital camera is a **direct physical connection**. Yamada does not teach or suggest establishing a wireless network connection, as required by claim 29. Therefore Yamada fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 29 that are missing from Bateman.

Terakado teaches a remote control that sends and receives data with a base unit using infrared light. (Terakado, page 4, paragraph [0058]). The infrared light is sent directly from the remote control to the base unit, and directly from the base unit to the remote control. Terakado does not teach or suggest sending the infrared light through a network. Rather, the connection between the remote control and the base unit is a **direct infrared connection**. Terakado does not teach or suggest establishing a wireless network connection, as required by claim 29. Therefore, Terakado fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 29 missing from Bateman and Yamada.

None of Bateman, Yamada or Terakado, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 29. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claim 29 and its associated dependent claim are in a condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3 and 6

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada and further in view of Terakado.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device to a remote host device, the method comprising:

establishing a connection between the data capture device and a pipeline device;

establishing a **wireless network connection** between the data capture device and the remote host device via the pipeline device, **wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the data capture device and the remote host device without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device or the remote host device for enabling said communication**;

upon establishing the wireless network connection, automatically verifying that the wireless network connection has been established between said data capture device and said remote host device and automatically initiating an immediate transfer of information from said data capture device;

automatically providing notification that said transfer of information is in process; and

automatically providing notification of successful completion of said transfer of information by one of illumination or extinguishing of a light on said data capture device.

(emphasis added).

Bateman teaches a camera base unit (cradle) for connecting a digital camera to a local host, and enabling file transfer between the digital camera and the local host. (Bateman, paragraph [0009]; Figure 1). The camera base unit may be connected to the local host via a wired connection or a wireless connection. (Bateman, paragraph [0021]). Both the wired connection and the wireless connection taught by Bateman are connections **made through a universal serial bus (USB)** or other similar external bus to a computer. (Bateman, paragraph [0021]). A wireless connection made through a universal serial bus or other similar bus as taught by Bateman is not a wireless network connection. Therefore, the wireless connection taught by Bateman is not a **wireless *network* connection**, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, Bateman teaches that on-camera and on-host software programs are necessary to enable the transfer of images between the digital camera and the local host or remote host. (Bateman, paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0032], paragraph [0038]). For example, Bateman states, "[i]nherent in the description of events shown in Fig. 7 is that various software components have already been loaded at the host through an application

install as described above." (Bateman, paragraph [0038]). In contrast, claim 1 includes the limitation, "wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the data capture device and the remote host device **without installation of dedicated software** on the pipeline device or the remote host device for enabling said communication."

For at least the above reasons, Bateman fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1.

Yamada teaches inserting an auxiliary memory card into a digital camera. Files may then be transferred from a main memory to the auxiliary memory card. (Yamada, col. 4, lines 32-35). Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 missing from Bateman.

Terakado teaches a remote control that sends and receives data with a base unit using infrared light. (Terakado, page 4, paragraph [0058]). Terakado fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 missing from Bateman and Yamada.

None of Bateman, Yamada, or Terakado, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and its associated dependent claims are in a condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner remove his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-5, 7 and 10-14

Claims 4-5, 7, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada in view of Terakado and in further view of Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,954, hereinafter "Okada").

Okada teaches a digital camera that warns a user when a digital photograph is to be deleted. Okada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 missing from Bateman, Yamada and Terakado.

None of Bateman, Yamada, Terakado or Okada, alone or in combination, teach or

suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 4-5, 7 and 10-14 depend from, and thus include the limitations of, claim 1. Therefore, claims 4-5, 7 and 10-14 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and its associated dependent claims are in a condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner remove his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 15, 18, 21-22 and 25

Claims 15, 18, 21-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada.

As amended, claim 15 recites:

A method facilitating transfer of information from a first device to a second device capable of communicating with said first device, the method comprising:
establishing a connection between the first device and a pipeline device;
establishing a **wireless network connection** between the first device and the second device via the pipeline device, wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the first device and the second device **without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device or the second device for enabling said communication**;
upon establishing the wireless network connection between the first device and the second device, automatically providing notification of the establishment of connectivity between said first device and said second device, enabling immediate automatic initiation of a transfer of information from said first device to said second device;
upon initiation of a transfer of information from said first device to said second device, automatically providing feedback while said transfer of information is in process; and
automatically providing notification of completion of said transfer of information.

(emphasis added).

Bateman teaches a camera base unit (cradle) for connecting a digital camera to a local host, and enabling file transfer between the digital camera and the local host. (Bateman, paragraph [0009]; Figure 1). The camera base unit may be connected to the local host via a

wired connection or a wireless connection. (Bateman, paragraph [0021]). Both the wired connection and the wireless connection taught by Bateman are connections **made through a universal serial bus (USB)** or other similar external bus. (Bateman, paragraph [0021]). A wireless connection made through a universal serial bus or other similar bus as taught by Bateman is not a wireless network connection. Therefore, the wireless connection taught by Bateman is not a **wireless *network* connection**, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, Bateman teaches that on-camera and on-host software programs are necessary to enable the transfer of images between the digital camera and the local host or remote host. (Bateman, paragraph [0023]; paragraph [0032], paragraph [0038]). For example, Bateman states, "[i]nherent in the description of events shown in Fig. 7 is that various software components have already been loaded at the host through an application install as described above." (Bateman, paragraph [0038]). In contrast, claim 1 includes the limitation, "wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the data capture device and the remote host device **without installation of dedicated software** on the pipeline device or the remote host device for enabling said communication."

For at least the above reasons, Bateman fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1.

Yamada teaches inserting an auxiliary memory card into a digital camera. Files may then be transferred from a main memory to the auxiliary memory card. (Yamada, col. 4, lines 32-35). Yamada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 missing from Bateman.

Neither Yamada nor Bateman, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claim 15 and its associated dependent claims are in a condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner remove his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

<u>Claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24 and 26-28</u>

Claims 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman in view of Yamada and in further view of Okada.

Okada teaches a digital camera that warns a user when a digital photograph is to be deleted. Okada fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 15 missing from Yamada and Bateman.

None of Yamada, Bateman or Okada, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15. Claims 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 26 depend from, and thus include the limitations of, claim 15. Therefore, claims 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 26 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 15. Accordingly, applicants respectfully assert that claim 15 and its associated dependent claims are in a condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner remove his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections and submits that pending claims 1-7, 10-16, 18-26, 29 and 30 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Benjamin Kimes at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 5, 2007

/Judith A. Szepesi/
Judith A. Szepesi
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,393

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300